

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 17, 18, 28, 35, 58, 61-64, and 68-70 are pending in this case. Claims 17 and 28 are amended and Claims 68-70 are added by the present amendment. The changes to Claims 17 and 28 are supported in the originally filed disclosure at least at page 10, line 10, to page 12, line 10. New Claims 68-70 are supported in the originally filed disclosure at least at Figure 4(a) and at page 10, line 10, to page 12, line 10. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 17, 35, and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takagi, et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0189557 A1, herein “Takagi”) in view of Engstrom (U.S. Pat. No. 6,944,482 B2), and further in view of Park, et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0038982 A1, herein “Park”), Claims 28 and 62-64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takagi in view of Engstrom, Park¹, and further in view of Hawkins, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,356,361 B1, herein “Hawkins”), and Claims 18 and 58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takagi in view of Engstrom, Park, and further in view of Lee (U.S. Pat. No. 7,110,796 B2).

At the outset, Applicants and Applicants’ representatives thank Examiner Leiby for the courtesy of an interview with Applicants’ representatives on March 3, 2010. The discussion during that interview is substantially reflected in the amendments and remarks presented herein. Further, Applicants request that Examiner Leiby contact Applicants’ representatives to clarify any further issues encountered during examination of the present response.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of Claims 17, 18, 28, 35, 58, and 61-64 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

¹ In the Office Action, Claims 28 and 62-64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takagi in view of Engstrom, Park, and further in view of Hawkins. However, in the detailed rejection of Claims 28 and 62-64, Park was not asserted to teach any features of any of the claims.

With regard to Claim 17, the outstanding Office Action asserts Takagi as teaching every element except “an LED display panel which is arranged in a display window formed on a casing surface of said display-side casing other than a surface provided with the main display part,” which it asserts Engstrom as teaching, and that “said display-side casing is configured to be rotatable by at least approximately 180° about a rotation axis perpendicular to the core of the first axis of the hinge,” which it asserts Park as teaching.

Amended Claim 17 recites, *inter alia*, “a display control unit controlling display contents of said plurality of light-emitting diodes of said LED display panel on the basis of input display data input by a user through said operation part” and “a main control unit controlling both said main display part and said LED display panel and outputting said input display data displayed on said LED display panel.”

Thus, amended Claim 17 requires that the **contents of the display output** of the LED display panel is “**input by a user through said operation part.**” As discussed during the interview, none of the cited referenced teach or suggest display contents which were input by a user. Further, as discussed during the interview, the cited references do not teach or suggest any common control of the “main display part” and the “LED display panel” as defined by the recitation in amended Claim 17 of “a main control unit **controlling both said main display part and said LED display panel.**”

Takagi illustrates, at Figures 1 and 2, and describes, at paragraphs [0008], [0021], and [0022], a first display part 16 and a second display part 18 within a panel 22 of a cellular phone. However, Takagi is silent as to the display of “input display data input by a user through said operation part” or “a main control unit controlling both said main display part and said LED display panel,” as recited by Claim 17.

Engstrom and Park fail to cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Takagi, as discussed during the interview.

Engstrom illustrates, at Figures 3a and 3b, and describes, at column 5, lines 20-55, that the selective activation and deactivation of LEDs 1114 is determined by a visualization controller 1112 according to requests of various visualization agents 1104-1108. For instance, Engstrom describes that telephony visualization agent 1102 is responsible for effecting visualization of various predetermined telephony events such as the arrival of an incoming call, that telephony visualization agent 1106 is responsible for effecting visualization of various textual contents such as web pages, and that telephony visualization agent 1108 is responsible for effecting visualization of various sounds associated with wireless telephony such as streaming MPx audio.

However, Engstrom is silent as to any teaching or suggestion as to the display of “input display data input by a user through said operation part” or “a main control unit controlling both said main display part and said LED display panel,” as recited by Claim 17.

Park describes and illustrates a convertible computer with a single rotatable display 20 but is silent as to the above-discussed features of Claim 17 that are deficient in Takagi and Engstrom.

Additionally, as discussed during the interview, the proposed combination of Takagi, Engstrom, and Park, does not set forth a valid *prima facie* case of obviousness. Takagi describes, at paragraphs [0008], [0021], and [0022], that the second display part 18 within panel 22 of the cellular phone is provided such that the second display is **not normally seen**. According to paragraph [0009] of Takagi, when activated, the second display **suddenly appears** and “a user is given a deeper impression and surprises for the sudden indication.” Thus, one skilled in the relevant art would have been taught away from the proposed combination of Takagi in view of Engstrom. Modifying Takagi as suggested in the Office Action would have rendered the invention of Takagi unsuitable or inoperable for its intended

purpose under MPEP § 2143.01, because the large LEDs 1114 of Engstrom would be **normally seen** rather than **not normally seen**.

Because, even in combination, Takagi, Engstrom, and Park fail to teach or suggest at least the above-discussed features of Claim 17 and fail to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claim 17, and Claims 35 and 61, which depend therefrom, be withdrawn.

Claims 18 and 58 depend from Claim 17 and, therefore, patentably define over Takagi, Engstrom, and Park for at least the same reasons as Claim 17. Further, Lee which was additionally asserted against Claims 18 and 58 fails to cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Tagaki, Engstrom, and Park with regard to Claim 17 and was not asserted for the features of Claim 17 that are discussed above as deficient in the combination of Tagaki, Engstrom, and Park. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 18 and 58, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), be withdrawn.

Claim 28, while differing in scope and/or statutory class from Claim 17, patentably defines over Takagi, Engstrom, and Park for reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to Claim 17. Further, Hawkins, which is additionally asserted against Claim 28, fails to cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Takagi, Engstrom, and Park with regard to the display of “input display data input by a user through said operation part,” as recited by Claim 28, and fails to teach or suggest “a main control unit controlling both said main display part and said LED display panel,” as recited by amended Claim 28.

Additionally, Hawkins does not teach or suggest additional features of the main control unit as defined by amended Claim 28.

Hawkins illustrates, at Figures 1A and 1B, and describes, at column 8, lines 14-45, a hand held device 102 having a jog rocker switch 126 operable when a lid 106 is closed to affect a main display unit 128. Hawkins describes that, although the device may be in a

power-save state when the lid is closed, a user may actuate the jog rocker 126 to cause the device to transition from a power-save state to a power-on state and, thereby, make a main display 128 become operational by launching an application.

However, as discussed during the interview, Hawkins describes only a main display unit 128 transitioning power states via jog-rocker switch 126 and is silent as to switching display contents of “an LED display panel which is arranged in a display window formed on a casing surface of said display-side casing other than a surface provided with the main display part,” as recited by Claim 28. Hawkins does not describe a main control unit that **“switches the LED display between a power on display state and a power off state and switches the display contents of the LED display panel under a power on display state,”** as recited by amended Claim 28, because Hawkins describes **only switching power states**.

Because, even in combination, Takagi, Engstrom, Park, and Hawkins fail to teach or suggest at least the above-discussed features of Claim 28 and also fail to present a proper *prima facie* case of obviousness for reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to Claim 17, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claim 28 and Claims 62-64, which depend therefrom, be withdrawn.


New Claims 68 and 70 recite that “the input display data input by the user is input on an LED-by-LED basis,” to further distinguish a user’s ability to configure the data to be displayed as described, for example, at page 10, line 10, to page 11, line 2.

New Claim 69 recites features previously presented in Claim 28, but depends from Claim 17.

Accordingly, the outstanding rejections are traversed and the pending claims are believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 07/09)

Usha Munukutla-Parker
Registration No. 61,939